REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of January 30, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 19-50 are currently pending. Claims 19-50 stand rejected. As explained in more detail below, the Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 19-50 are Rejected Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 19-50 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck, et al. (US 6,604,140) in view of Haartsen, et al. (Proceedings of IEEE, Volume 88, Issue 10, October 2000, Pages 1651-1661) and if further view of Lunsford, et al. (US 6,901,434).

The Office Action maintains the assertion that Beck discloses a wireless communication system wherein individual wireless terminals of a group perform at least one function in addition to performing wireless communication with each other which is common to the individual terminals of the group and performing at least one function which is not common to individual wireless terminals of the group. (Office Action dated 01/30/06; page 4; see also Office Action dated 09/23/05; pages 3 – 4). As discussed in the Response dated 12/20/2005 and further elaborated below, the Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion as the claim limitations are not met and the "services" of Beck are not equivalent to the "functions" as recited in the rejected claims.

First, looking to Beck's disclosed embodiments of "service users" and "service advertisers", it is apparent that the limitations of the rejected claims are not met. For example, independent claims 19, 27, and 29 specify that when the terminals are in a group, the total

number of functions available to be performed by the individual wireless terminals of the group, in addition to performing the wireless communication with each other, is greater than a total number of functions available to be performed by the individual wireless terminals when the individual wireless terminals are not in the group. As clearly stated in the Substitute Specification of the present application, a "basic concept of the invention is to use the terminal and the applications that are contained therein together to acquire greater functionality than is possible by one terminal singly." (Page 4; paragraph [0017]).

The mobile devices of Beck cited by the Office Action are either service advertisers, service users, or a device that is both a service advertiser and a service user. (*See* Beck; Col. 8, lines 49 – 53). A service announcer "announces the availability of services to other devices", and a service user "hosts one or more clients that use one or more services on the device". (Col. 3, lines 61 – 63 and 64 – 66). Obviously, a device that is both a service advertiser and a service user has both capabilities. First looking to service advertisers, the total number of functions available to be performed does not increase on the device when part of a group. For example, "Device 2-101 depicts a service advertiser...[which] includes an advertiser 106, that performs the advertising function". (Col. 3, lines 62 – 66 and Col. 4, lines 37 – 8). As shown in Figure 2, the advertiser retrieves a service the device wishes to advertise (step 201), and after creating a service descriptor for that service (step 202), the advertiser multicasts the service descriptor (step 203). Regardless of whether the advertiser is alone or in a group it performs the same function. There is no indication that the advertiser can perform additional functions when in a group. Therefore, whether alone or in a group is has the same function – to advertise.

Looking next at the service users, the total number of functions available to be performed on the device does not increase when part of a group. Fore example, Device 2-121 represents a service user which hosts one or more clients that use services on the device. The server user listens for milti-casted service descriptors through a listener (*see.* listener 127). (Col. 5, lines 1 – 2).). As shown in Figure 3, the advertiser listens and retrieves a service descriptor (step 301). Regardless of whether the service user is alone or in a group it performs the same function – it listens for service descriptors. Indeed, as recognized by the Office Action, the service user will only have <u>access</u> to other <u>services</u>. (Office Action dated 01/30/06; page 5). Their functionality will not be altered. Merely having access to other services in which you may execute those functions in not equivalent. Even upon acquiring a service, there is no indication in Beck that once a service user accesses a service from the advertisers, they could only get the extra "functionality" of that service when in a group as compared to when not in a group. In fact, Beck states:

> "[t]he discovered service is now available to all clients running on the device for the time interval specified by the period of validity, or until the service is removed by a removal command. By allowing both a removal command and a period of validity, services can be removed from the device via a combination of explicit (e.g. Removal command) and implicit (e.g. Expiration of period of validity) mechanisms.

(Col. 5, lines 18 – 25; *see also* Col. 6, line 66 – 67 to Col. 7, line 1). Nowhere does Beck state the service is only available when in a group. For example, the Office Action states that expanded "functionality" can be met by the accessibility of printing services (see page 2 of Office Action dated 01/30/06). First, there is no indication that the printing service is only available when the device is with a group. Second, there is no indication that every device in the group has not also accessed the service, therefore, making it a common service.

The Applicants maintain that the services depicted in Beck are not equivalent to the functions as recited in the rejected claims as discussed above but rather set forth the argument to show that even with the extra "functionality" suggested by the Examiner, the claim limitations are not met. For example, looking to Claim 25 further illustrates this point. Claim 25 further limits claim 19 by reciting "wherein at least one additional function becomes available to the group only when a minimum number of the plurality of wireless terminals join the group." Again the Office Action asserts this limitation is met when the service users have access to other needed services by communicating with the service advertisers that have the services as "said services will therefore have access to a greater number of services thus expanding their functionality, the number of mobile devices can be any number, thus there can be a minimum number of said mobile devices." (Office Action dated 01/30/06; page 12). First, merely having services accessible to devices on a network is not equivalent to only having additional functions available when a minimum threshold of terminals join the group. Indeed, the Office Action does not point to any teaching or suggestion in Beck regarding such a threshold that must be met to gain the added functionality. In contrast, in referencing Beck, the Office Action states "the number of mobile devices can be any number." (Office Action dated 01/30/06; page 12).

Moreover, specifically regarding Lunsford, the Office Action asserts the reference discloses "users of a plurality of wireless terminals deciding to form a group" as recited in the rejected claims. The Applicants 1) respectfully disagree that the alleged "groups" of Lunsford are equivalent to the "groups" as recited in the rejected claims, and 2) Lunsford teaches away from the subject matter of the rejected claims.

First, Lunsford discloses an invention for data <u>synchronization</u> between two handheld computers. (Lunsford; Field of the Invention; Col. 1, lines 9 – 10). As one skilled in the art will readily appreciate, the goal of synchronizing is to create an identical copy, therefore upon forming a "group" according to Lunsford, there can be no "sharing the at least one function which is <u>not common</u> to each of the wireless terminals so that a total number of functions available to be performed by the individual wireless terminals of the group, in addition to performing the wireless communication with each other, is greater than a total number of functions available to be performed by the individual wireless terminals when the individual wireless terminals are not in the group" as specified by the defined groups of the rejected claims.

Along these lines, Lunsford teaches away from the subject matter of the rejected claims. Indeed, applying Lunsford to Beck and Haartsen would synchronize data among service advertisers or service users utilizing Bluetooth technology and would not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of the rejected claims, including, for example "individual wireless terminals of a group [that] perform at least one function in addition to performing wireless communication with each other which is common to the individual terminals of the group and performing at least one function which is not common to individual wireless terminals of the group."

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, the Applicants submit that the art of record does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of the rejected claims and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejected claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and a finding of their allowability. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 30, 2006

By: _____
Shawn P. Gorman
Reg. No. 56,197

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001